

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on August 23, 2005. Claims 1-12, 14-24 and 30 are pending in this case. Of these claims, claims 1-12, 14-16, 18, 22-24 and 30 are rejected. Claims 19-21 are allowed. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the indication of the allowable subject matter.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 17 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but was indicated as being otherwise allowable. Claim 17 has been rewritten herein to include the limitations of the corresponding base claims. As such, applicant submits that claim 17 is in an allowable form.

SECTION 103 REJECTIONS

Pending claims 1-8, 10-12, 14-18, 22-24 and 30 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 (a) over the combination of Li U.S. Patent No. 6,712,320 as modified by Lambert U.S. Patent No. 5,795,162. Of the rejected claims set, claim 1 is an independent claim. The remaining pending claims are dependent from claim 1.

Claim 1 has been amended to further clarify the present invention. Claim 1 as further clarified and recited herein is not rendered obvious by the combination of Li and Lambert. In fact, the prior art references, as cited, in addition to failing to teach the recited invention, either alone or in combination, actually teach against making such a combination.

More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the plurality of shielded conductors are arranged in a body structure so that the inner and outer conductive elements are electrically presented at a contact face surface of the body structure in a generally co-planar arrangement. Furthermore, claim 1 generally recites that the co-planar arrangement is generally co-planar with the contact face surface of the body structure. That is, the shielded conductors and their inner/outer conductive elements are presented generally co-planar with the face surface of the body structure. When the compressible interface element is compressed between the face surface of the body structure and a signal bearing component, the geometric arrangements of the axial conductive elements is maintained in order to properly pass signals with the signal bearing component. As may be appreciated, the compression of the interface element is important for the high frequency applications to which the connector is directed, and the present invention with the inner/outer elements of the conductors generally co-planar with the contact face surface of the body structure provides the desirable compression of the conductors into the interface element.

The references of Li and Lambert clearly do not teach the invention as recited in claim 1 and the construction of the base Li reference would presumably not even achieve the desired signal passage as provided by the invention. Furthermore, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not even be motivated to combine the Li reference with the Lambert reference, because Li already addresses the compressibility of the circuit with a connector system that utilizes contacts that are already elastomeric. Using the elastomeric circuit of Li with the compression element 40 of the Lambert

reference, would provide an interconnection structure so mushy and flimsy that it is unlikely that a proper signal passage would be achieved. Certainly, high frequency/high speed signals, as addressed by the present invention, would be adversely affected by the flimsiness of such a connection. The compression element 40 set forth in Lambert would be absolutely superfluous with respect to a system that already exists in Li. Therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art would certainly not choose to interpose another compression element as shown in the Lambert connector system between a circuit board and the compressible conductors that already exists with Li. In fact, a person of ordinary skill in the art, desiring a clean signal passage between the compressible connector system of Li and a circuit board would not place another compressible element between the connector and circuit board. Nor would a person of ordinary skill in the art seek to modify the Li reference to somehow use the compressible connection element 40 in Lambert. Accordingly the Lambert reference combination would not provide the necessary teaching to render obvious the present invention recited in claim 1.

More specifically, turning to the Li reference, that reference teaches an elastomeric connector system wherein a plurality of elastomeric contacts are contained in a housing block. Each of the elastomeric contacts 5 includes a compressible core 14 surrounded by wound, compressible conductors 12. All of the conductors in Li are themselves compressible. The conductors all have ends that stick out of the housing block 18 as shown in Figure 1. As illustrated in Fig 1, the ends of the elastomeric contacts 5 extend outwardly from the face surface of the housing block 18 so that they

may compress against a circuit board. Thus, the Li reference does not teach a plurality of shielded conductors that are arranged in a body structure so that the inner and outer conductors are in a co-planar arrangement which is co-planar with the contact face surface of the body structure. This is because the actual contact 5 of the Li elements are compressible and must extend out of the housing block to be compressible such as with the wiring board illustrated in Fig 2. Generally, if the Li reference were to be constructed according to the limitations set forth in pending claim 1, wherein the shielded conductors are presented generally co-planar with the contact face surface of the body structure, the compressibility of the contacts 5 would be destroyed and thus Li would be rendered inoperable. Certainly, a person of ordinary skill in the art would never choose to modify a system of the prior art which would render that system inoperable.

Furthermore, not only does Li fail to teach the combination of the invention in claim 1 but also a person of ordinary skill in the art would not even be remotely motivated to somehow combine Li with Lambert to yield the invention set forth in claim 1.

For example, because of the compressibility of the contacts as set forth in Li there would be no need to even utilize the compression interconnect as set forth in Lambert. If the Lambert reference was combined with Li, it would present the situation of elastomeric contacts 5 which are compressible in themselves, being smashed against a compression interconnect 40. That is, it would be one compressible element pressed against another compressible element. Not only would that not be necessary

according to the teachings of both Li and Lambert, but presumably would not provide a desirable passage of signals through the connector system to a signal bearing component, such as a printed circuit board. Therefore, when it is desirable to have a robust and accurate passage of high speed signals through a connector and to and from a signal bearing component, such as a printed circuit board, it would never be desirable to place layer upon layer of compressible components between shielded conductors and a circuit board. But this is now what the Examiner argues would be obvious based upon the combination of Li and Lambert. Accordingly, applicant submits that Li/Lambert combination in no way renders obvious the invention recited in claim 1 under §103 of the patent statute. Thus, claim 1 is allowable over the cited art.

The additional rejected claims 2-8, 10-12, 14-18, 22-24 and 30 each depend from claim 1 and each recites a unique combination of elements which is not taught, suggested or otherwise rendered obvious by the combination Li/Lambert. Therefore, not only are those dependent claims allowable based upon the allowability of claim 1, but they are further allowable because they recite unique combinations of elements not rendered obvious because of the cited art.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) over Li/Lambert as further modified under Driscoll U.S. Patent No. 6,843,657. Specifically with respect to claim 3, Driscoll was recited to teach conductors that are twinax. With respect to claim 4, Driscoll is recited to teaching a fastener to compress an element.

As noted above, the Li/Lambert combination does not in anyway teach the invention as recited in claim 1. The addition of Driscoll does not in anyway provide

additional teaching, such that the three reference Li/Lambert/Driscoll combination would render obvious claim 1. Claims 3 and 4 each depend from claim 1 and thus are allowable for that reason. Furthermore, they recited unique combinations of elements not rendered obvious by the cited art. Accordingly claims 3 and 4 are also allowable.

Applicant submits that the currently pending claims are in an allowable form and, therefore, requests a Notice of Allowability of the application at the Examiner's earliest convenience. If any issues remain in the case which might be handled in an expedited fashion, such as through a telephone call or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is certainly encouraged to telephone the Applicant's representative or to issue an Examiner's Amendment.

Applicant does not believe that any fees are due in connection with this response other than the one month extension fee. However, if such petition is due or any fees are necessary, the Commissioner may consider this to be a request for such and charge any necessary fees to deposit account 23-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.



Kurt A. Summe
Reg. No. 36,023

2700 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 241-2324 (voice)
(513) 421-7269 (facsimile)